

REMARKS:

The Office Action dated July 21, 2008 has been received and carefully reviewed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks form a full and complete response thereto. Claim 1 has been amended as to form only. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, including new independent claim 4 added by this amendment, are pending in the application and submitted for reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arikita (U.S. Patent No. 5,358,226). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that claims 1-3 recite subject matter that is not disclosed by Arikita.

Independent claim 1 defines a brush mounting structure in which the mounting arrangements of the front and rear portions of the brush differ such that the front of the brush is more firmly engaged with the brush mount than the rear of the brush. Arikita does not disclose this feature. Instead, as can be clearly seen in Figure 2 of Arikita, the brush projections 18 and the brush mount projections 13 with which the brush projections are engaged are identical at the front and back of the brush. Thus, Arikita does not disclose a mounting structure in which the mounting arrangements of the front and rear portions of the brush differ.

The Office Action questions what structure is being claimed that causes one side of the brush to be hooked more firmly than another side of the brush. Independent claim 1 clearly recites that the brush projections of the front row are configured

differently than the brush projections of the back rows and that the holding rib of the brush mount is configured differently than the engaging rib of the brush mount so that the relative strength of the engagement of the projections and the ribs in the front row of projections and at the front of the brush mount compared to the strength of engagement in the projections and ribs at the back of the brush and the brush mount. The application as filed provides disclosure of various ways in such a more firm engagement can be achieved, such as different profiles shown in the figures and the use of an overhanging surface which is inclined or curved upwardly or downwardly and the use of inclined surfaces and the resilience of the materials as discussed at, for example, page 10 of the specification. Accordingly, the claim does recite concrete structure for achieving the differential engagement forces, and this is not merely a "talking point" as suggested in the Office Action.

New independent claim 4 recites subject matter not disclosed by the cited art and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons outlined above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above, all objections and rejections have been sufficiently addressed. The Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and requests that this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Richard Wydeven /
Richard Wydeven
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,881
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK
1425 K. Street, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 783-6040

1482058_1

1530524-1